

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Re-examination and favorable reconsideration in light of the above amendments and the following comments are respectfully requested.

1. Let it be said that a patent attorney did review the application and approved it.
2. The last two paragraphs of “**DETAILED DESCRIPTION OF THE INVENTION**” were anticipated in the original claims. Hence they are a bona fide amendment and are not new matter. They were requested by the Examiner, along with additional drawings, in the Office Reply signed by the Examiner on 12/31/04. Had the Office not illegally published this application on 9/1/05, refiling might have been an option, but now that is not a reasonable consideration.
3. To ask an inventor to reveal intellectual property, put him/her through the process of amendment, lose his paperwork, claim abandonment against him illegally, and then attempt to disallow is both shameful and criminal.
4. Apparently the Examiner does not understand the work of Harness (USP 3,592,104). There are no similarities between Harness and the ideas put forth by myself. His is a hydraulic oil motor in which one vane is stationery and maintains a pocket of oil as a seal, while the other vane rotates about 180 degrees. Then by means of alternating intake and outlet ports, the second vane moves in the same direction about 180 degrees. There is no frictionless valve disc involved, nor is there clockwise/counter-clockwise movement of the vanes in separate housings.
5. With regards to Kemp (USP 4,558,669), there are some similarities in that he proposes a rotary motor having a valve disc or discs, apparently an attempt to improve on Nutko

(USP 3,739,754) and Suzuki (USP 4,003,348). However, all of the above are rotary motors of a lobate design, similar to the Wankel. Mine is not. Kemp attempts to maintain frictional surfaces between the power rotor and its housing and between the valve disc or discs and the power rotor. Mine does not. In other words, Kemp is a frictional lobate design and mine is not. As such, I do not believe that the prior art as cited has any relevance.

For the foregoing reasons, the instant application is believed to be in condition for allowance. The Examiner is respectfully requested to allow the application and its amendments without further endless and tedious objections.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, reading "Delbert L. Hartman". The signature is written in dark ink and is positioned above the printed name.

Delbert Lee Hartman